

The Four (or Seven) Archangels in the First Book of Enoch and Early Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period

CHRISTOPH BERNER, GÖTTINGEN

1. Introduction and Terminology

Although the monotheistic creed became the fundamental basis of Early Judaism, structures of polytheistic thinking continued to exist in a modified way. The common Ancient Near Eastern idea of a heavenly court, where the supreme deity presides over the assembly of minor deities, lived on in the concept of an angelic world populated by different classes of heavenly beings each fulfilling a specific function. Besides the angels of presence, who stand around the divine throne in constant praise of the Lord, there are also angels that interfere with the human world, e.g. by being responsible for certain natural phenomena (cf. Jub 2:2). However, speculations on the sphere of the angels did not only deal with its differentiation, but focused also on defining a hierarchy. It is in this context that the concept of a group of supreme angels was shaped, who are now universally known as archangels.

It should, however, be noted that the term 'archangel' is somewhat anachronistic when we are dealing with the early stages of this idea. The Greek term ἄρχαγγελος ("ruling angel") from which it derives does not occur in the Septuagint and lacks a Hebrew or Aramaic equivalent. While the First Book of Enoch may have originally used the expression עירין וקדישין ("watchers and holy ones"),¹ the Book of Daniel, the only text in the OT that mentions supreme angels by name, refers to them as "prince" (שׁר) or counts them among the "chief princes" (השׁרים הגדלים).² In rendering the latter phrase as οἱ ἄρχοντοι οἱ πρώτοι, the Septuagint is

1 See below.

2 Cf. Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1. A similar terminology is used in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, which speak of שׁמי רואי נשׁמי (cf. 4Q403 and 4Q405). For an overview on the various Hebrew and Aramaic designations of angelic beings, see Davidson, Angels 327-342.

at least reminiscent of the later terminology, as is the case in Josh 5:14 where the “commander of the army of the Lord” (**שַׁר צְבָא יְהוָה**) was translated as ἀρχιστρατηγός.³

Still, the term ἀρχάγγελος, although here may lie part of its origin, has found no way into the Greek translations of the OT. As a designation of the angelic princes, it seems to have become popular only around the turn of the era.⁴ Nonetheless, the customary term ‘archangel’ remains appropriate even with regard to the earlier texts, insofar as it precisely expresses the idea of a group of supreme angels. In this sense it will be used in the following article.

In dealing with the early stages in the development of the concept of archangels, I will primarily focus on the First Book of Enoch which contains the oldest relevant texts. On this basis, other Jewish texts from Second Temple times will be treated. I will first examine those passages of 1En that deal with the number of archangels, and in a second step try to sketch the profiles and tasks of their individual representatives. As a result, only the “good” angelic princes mentioned in the respective lists of archangels will be subject to this article. Their evil opponents are dealt with elsewhere in this volume; cf. Dochhorn, Motif (in this volume).

2. Early Lists of Archangels

As early as the Book of Watchers (1En 6-36), dating in its oldest parts from the fourth century BCE, there are lists that enumerate either four (1En 9:1) or seven archangels (1En 20:1-8).⁵ Although diverging in the overall number and in the names of the archangels, both versions share one fundamental similarity in including Michael, Gabriel and Raphael among the angels listed. These three did not only become the most prominent archangels in reception history, they also must have already

3 Cf. also Theodotion’s rendering of the Hebrew **הַשָּׁר הַגָּדוֹל** in Dan 12:1 (ό ἄρχων ὁ μέγας).

4 Possibly the oldest attestation of the term ἀρχάγγελος is found in the Greek translation of 1En (20:8), which may, at its earliest, date from the first century BCE; cf. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 14. The term is furthermore attested in writings of the early Christian period (4 Ezra 4:36; 1Thess 4:16; Jude 9).

5 While the Ethiopic translation of 1En 20:1 refers to them as to the “holy angels who watch,” the Greek text reads ἄγγελοι τῶν δυνάμεων (“angels of the powers”). Although the original Aramaic version of the verse is not attested by any of the Qumran fragments, it is likely that it referred to **עִירִין וְקָדִישִׁין** (“watchers and holy ones”; cf. Dan 4:10, 14, 20). Examples of a similar translation are 1En 1:2 (cf. 4QEn^a Fr. 1 I 3) and 93:2 (cf. 4QEn^b Fr. 1 III 21). On the subject of terminology, see also Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 140-141.

claimed a similar status in Early Judaism. However, when we turn towards the remaining angels that are mentioned in the respective lists the picture changes completely. Suddenly the sources offer a diversity of names, which bears witness to an ongoing debate concerning the question of who else was to be counted among the archangels.

This debate is vividly reflected by the different literary parts and translations of 1En. The original Aramaic version of 1En 9:1 includes Sariel among the four archangels, thus mentioning **מיכאל ושריאל ורפאל ובריאל** (4QEn^b Fr. 1 III 7).⁶ The same four names are also attested in the War Scroll (1QM IX 15-16). However, in the Greek translation of 1En 9:1 Sariel is no longer mentioned, but has been replaced with Uriel (cf. 10:1). Although a scribal error might have caused the change,⁷ it should not be overlooked that, with regard to the prominent role of Uriel in 1En 19-21; 72-82 (see below), an intentional alteration cannot be excluded.⁸ Still another name completes the list of the four archangels in the latest part of 1 Enoch, the so-called Book of Parables (chs. 37-71).⁹ Here, an angel with the name Phanuel appears instead of Sariel / Uriel (1En 40:8-9; 53:6; 70:11, 16).¹⁰

By identifying the four archangels with the four heavenly beings known from Ezekiel's inaugural vision, 1En 40:9 points to Ezek 1 as to the possible biblical background of the concept of four supreme angelic princes.¹¹ The basic idea behind the four beings of Ezek 1 is that each of them corresponds to one of the four directions resp. the four quarters of the world which illustrate the spatial dimension of God's mastery of the universe. This idea, which is also attested elsewhere in the OT (cf. e.g. Isa 11:12; Ezek 37:9), has to be seen against the background of a

6 Cf. 4QEn^a Fr. 1 IV 6: [מיכאל ושריאל ורפאל ובריאל]. The reconstructions of the fragments are based on Milik, Books.

7 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 202, suggests that the change results from the confusion of initial *omicron* with initial *sigma*.

8 Uriel is also mentioned as the fourth archangel in Apoc Mos 40:1 and Sib Or 2:215 (manuscript family Ψ; cf. Geffcken, *Oracula* 38). See, however, Dochhorn, Apokalypse 524, who argues that, on the basis of the variant manuscript readings, one has to assume that Apoc Mos 40:1 originally only mentioned three archangels (Michael, Gabriel and Uriel).

9 That the Book of Parables is the latest part of 1En is shown by the fact that it is not attested in the Aramaic fragments that were found at Qumran. On the complicated questions concerning its origins and literary development, see Black, Book 181-193.

10 On the changing identity of the fourth archangel, see Black, Book 201; Milik, Books 172-173; Yadin, Scroll 238.

11 Cf. Bousset / Gressmann, Religion 326; Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 207. A similar connection between the four archangels and the beings at the four sides of God's throne is also drawn in Rabbinic writings (Num. Rab. 2:10; Pesiq. Rab. 46:3; Pirqe R. El. 4), with the sole exception that it is again Uriel and not Phanuel who is included in the lists.

“complex Babylonian system of astral and cosmic symbolism”¹² from which it derives. Although one can not be sure, whether the tradition of four archangels is in fact dependent upon the text of Ezek 1, it seems nevertheless likely to conclude that it shares the same Babylonian heritage, although it is no longer focused on cosmological or astronomical questions, but rather interested in angelic hierarchy.

The tradition of seven archangels finds a biblical parallel in Ezek 9. Here, the visionary beholds six men with deadly weapons in their hands who are accompanied by a further, different figure with a writing case (9:2). Due to this particular description of the seven men, Hermann Gunkel has suggested that the respective passage is dependent on a Babylonian tradition that counts seven supreme deities, one of whom is the god of writing Nabu.¹³ The parallel is, indeed, conspicuous and could thus point to the background of Ezek 9. Consequently, the concept of seven archangels might have been only one further step on the same line of development. One should, however, not overlook the possibility of a different background: Babylonian lists of seven demons¹⁴ as well as the Persian doctrine of the Heptad, consisting of Ahura Mazdā and the six Amāšas Spāntas,¹⁵ show that groups of seven supernatural beings were quite a frequent phenomenon. How the concept of seven archangels precisely evolved therefore remains an open question.

Notwithstanding the early precursors of the tradition of seven archangels, the earliest extant list that contains their names is only attested in 1En 20. The chapter provides the names of the angels that accompany Enoch on his eastward journey which is reported in 1En 21-36. It mentions Uriel, Raphael, Raguel, Michael, Sariel, Gabriel and Remiel. Yet, it is striking that Remiel, the only one who does not reappear during Enoch’s journey, is also textually dubious: the respective verse, 1En 20:8, is altogether missing in the Ethiopic tradition and is only attested in the duplicate section of the Greek Gizeh Papyrus.¹⁶

The fact that the overall number of seven archangels is first mentioned as the concluding statement of 1En 20:8 makes it appear possible that the list originally only contained the names of the six angelic protagonists of the following narrative. The reason for its secondary expansion might then be found in the attempt to adjust the passage to the

12 Uehlinger / Müller Trufaut, *Ezekiel 1* 163.

13 Cf. Gunkel, *Schreiberengel* 294-300.

14 Cf. Ebeling, *Dämonen* 107-108.

15 Cf. Boyce, *Amāša Spānta* 933-936. A Persian background of the seven archangels has already been proposed by Kohut, *Angelologie*.

16 Cf. Black, *Apocalypse* 32.

already existing tradition of seven archangels.¹⁷ Alternatively, one could follow Nickelsburg in assuming that 1En 81:1-4 was originally part of the narrative in 1En 20-36, and that the nameless angel holding the heavenly tablets in 81:1 is no other than Remiel.¹⁸

Even if one follows Nickelsburg and assumes that the list of the seven archangels in 1En 20 is original, it would still belong to a literary stratum of 1En that is younger than the narrative about the rebellion of the watchers (1En 6-16).¹⁹ The passages in 1En 9-10 that mention only four archangels may therefore claim literary priority. This observation does, of course, not allow the conclusion that the concept of seven archangels is a later development, because both concepts evidently draw on earlier traditions and were not invented by the authors of 1 Enoch. Furthermore, it must not be overlooked that the respective lists appear in distinct contexts: the four archangels are part of the watcher myth, while the seven archangels are connected with Enoch's heavenly journey (1En 20-36).

This last observation is underscored by the Animal Apocalypse (1En 85-90), a text that dates most likely from the time of the Maccabean Revolt.²⁰ Following the account in the Book of Watchers, 1En 88 describes the binding of the fallen watchers and the destruction of their breed as the work of four archangels (cf. 1En 10). In the preceding chapter, they are accompanied by three additional archangels who lift Enoch onto a high place from where he can watch the following events (1En 87:2-3; cf. 90:31). The latter passage is evidently inspired by the tradition of the seven archangels that accompany Enoch on his heavenly journey. By combining it with the tradition of the four angelic opponents of the fallen watchers, the author of the Animal Apocalypse arrived at a new synthesis: as four of the seven archangels are busy with the punishment of the watchers, the remaining three can show Enoch to his watchtower. Together, all seven return at the time of the final judgment and lead the rebel angels before God's throne where they are to receive their sentence (90:21).

Although it is clear that the author of the Animal Apocalypse counted seven archangels, we learn nothing about their names. The

17 That "the genuineness [of 1En 20:8] is guaranteed by the number 'seven'" (Black, Book 163) is not a strong argument, but rather a *petitio principii*. At least one example for a list of six archangels is provided by the admittedly late Tg. Ps.-J. ad Deut 34:6.

18 Cf. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 335-338.

19 While 1En 6-16 may date back to the last quarter of the fourth century BCE, chs. 20-36 seem to be no earlier than the late third century BCE; cf. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 170.293.

20 Cf. Berner, Jahre 169-181; Tiller, Commentary 78-79; VanderKam, Enoch 162.

allegoric text of the Animal Apocalypse only speaks of “white men” and leaves their identity a matter to be discussed by the readers.²¹ This silence with regard to the names, which is shared by Tob 12:15, the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice,²² Test Levi 8, and Rev 1:4,²³ leads us back to the earliest extant list in 1En 20. It may have already been in the mind of the author of the Animal Apocalypse²⁴ and will now serve as the basis of the following section of this article, which deals with the individual archangels.

3. The individual profiles and tasks of the seven archangels

The first archangel mentioned in 1En 20 is Uriel “who is in charge of the world and of Tartarus” (20:2). The connection of Uriel with Tartarus alludes to 1En 21:5, 9 (cf. 19:1) where it is the aforesaid angel who shows Enoch the places where the disobedient stars and the fallen angels are imprisoned. That Uriel is furthermore put in charge of the world ($\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\omega\kappa\sigma\mu\omega$) is most likely to be taken as a reference to the Astronomical Book (1En 72-82; cf. 33:3-4). In this text, of all the archangels only Uriel appears and guides Enoch through the celestial sphere. As the leader of the heavenly luminaries, he explains their courses and the laws they obey, thus providing information for the true calendar (72:1; 74:2; 75:3-4; 78:10; 79:6; 80:1; 82:7).²⁵

Both aspects, the dominion over the fiery depths and over the course of the luminaries, could easily be connected with the archangel’s name: Uriel, when derived from the Hebrew term אָרֵל , would have to be translated as “God is my fire,” which would stress the former aspect, while the latter would be implied, if one deduced the name from the term אָרֵל , thus interpreting it as “God is my light.”²⁶ Therefore, it is not

21 1En 90:22 counts the writer that records the deeds of the 70 heavenly shepherds, who are in charge of the final period of history, among the seven archangels. It is likely that the author here thought of Michael, because in 90:14 the same figure appears as a supporter of the faithful Jews in the final struggle against their oppressors. This role is characteristic of Michael who is known as the archangel that fights for Israel (see below). On this identification, see Black, Book 271.277; Davidson, Angels 109-110; Tiller, Commentary 360.

22 Cf. 4Q403 and 4Q405.

23 Cf. Rev 1:20; 3:1; 4:5; 5:6; 8:2, 6; 2 En 19.

24 Cf. Tiller, Commentary 246.

25 Cf. Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien* 178.

26 On the meaning of the name Uriel, see e.g. Noth, *Personennamen* 168-169; Davidson, Angels 91, who does, however, prefer the translation “Light/Flame of God”, which is also possible.

surprising that the “prince of light” (**שר המאור**) mentioned in 1QM XIII 10 (cf. 1QS III 20; CD V 18) has sometimes been identified with Uriel.²⁷ However, the characteristics of this figure make it more likely that we are dealing here with Michael.²⁸

Early reception history draws mainly on Uriel’s connection with the imprisonment of the watchers. In the Greek translation of 1En 9-10 where Uriel has replaced Sariel, he joins the intercession of the archangels (ch. 9) and instructs Noah (10:1-3). According to the Sibylline Oracles (2:227-237) he opens the doors of Hades and leads its inhabitants to the place of the final judgment. The passage evidently elaborates on the motif that Uriel is in charge over Tartarus and applies it to an eschatological setting which is missing in 1En 19; 21. Yet, this characterization of Uriel finds a certain parallel in the Ethiopic translation of 1En 27:2-4 where it is no longer Sariel, but Uriel who shows Enoch the cursed valley in which the souls of the sinners will be gathered at the last times.

The second archangel mentioned in 1En 20 is Raphael “who is in charge of the spirits of men” (20:3). This characterization refers to 1En 22:3, 6 where it is Raphael who shows Enoch the caves into which the souls of the dead are gathered.²⁹ Evidently, in these passages the name Raphael was brought into connection with the **רפאים**, the shades of the dead (cf. e.g. Isa 14:9), whereas it was usually interpreted as “God has healed” (**רפא אל**).³⁰ Thus, according to 1En 40:9 Raphael “is set over all the diseases and all the wounds of the children of men,” and it is as an angel of healing that Raphael appears in the Book of Tobit (12:14-15).

Being counted among the four archangels, Raphael (with Michael, Gabriel and Sariel) is one of the heavenly opponents against the fallen watchers. However, he is not only commissioned to heal the wounds inflicted by their doings (1En 10:7), but also joins the intercessions of the archangels (1En 9) and is given the task of imprisoning the rebel angel Asael (1En 10:4-5). Finally, Raphael is commanded to write down all the sins of Asael (10:8), obviously to keep account of his deeds for the Day of Judgment (cf. 1En 89:59-64).

It is apparent that the individual profile of Raphael becomes somewhat blurred when he is acting as one of the four archangels. Apart from 1En 10:7 where he exerts his healing powers, the other actions reported of Raphael are no longer specifically connected with the attributes of this particular archangel, which have been sketched above. Yet, while according to 1En 10 the four archangels play at least differ-

27 Cf. Ginzberg, *Sekte* 35-37; Wernberg-Møller, *Manual* 71, n. 60.

28 See below.

29 1En 22:3, 6 are partly attested by 4QEn^g Fr. 1 XXII.

30 Cf. Noth, *Personennamen* 179; Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 295.

ent parts in the punishing of the fallen angels, the War Scroll presents them only as a collective opposing Israel's enemies. Here, Raphael appears again together with the same three archangels (1QM IX 15-16), and each of their names is to be written on the shields (מַגְנִים) attached to one of the four towers (מַגְלִות). The idea in the background of this scene is that the four archangels participate in the eschatological battle as Israel's defenders (cf. 1QM XII 8).³¹

While Raphael, together with Michael and Gabriel, belongs to the three prominent archangels, whose names are not missing in any of the early extant lists, Raguel, the third archangel mentioned in 1En 20, is less famous. The Greek form of his name ('Ραγουνήλ) seems to go back to an original Aramaic רָגָעֵל³² ("shepherd of God" or "friend of God").³³ According to 1En 20:4 Raguel "takes vengeance on the world of the luminaries," i.e. he punishes the transgressing stars (cf. 1En 18:13-16; 21:3-6). At first glance, 1En 23:4, the only other verse in 1En that mentions Raguel, seems to be consistent with this description of the archangel who here shows Enoch a relentless river of fire "which pursues all the luminaries of heaven." Yet, in the overall context of 23:1-4, the passage does not appear to deal with punishment, but rather expresses the idea of a fiery river "that provides fire for the luminaries as they set in the west" or of "a driving force to move them around to the beginning of their trajectories."³⁴

It has, therefore, been suggested that, instead of ἔκδιώκω ("to pursue"), the text originally had a form of ἔκδικέω ("to take vengeance"), thus exactly complying with 1En 20:4. This theory is further corroborated by the fact that "all the other visions in chs. 21-27 center on some aspect of the final judgment or its anticipation."³⁵ Moreover, the imagery of the burning mountains which concludes the narrative unit in 23:1-24:1 also occurs in 18:13; 21:3 where it expresses the punishment of the transgressing stars. It is, however, noteworthy that the latter passages do only refer to seven stars, while according to 23:4 the punishment affects *all* the luminaries of heaven. Although there is a clear incongruity with the afore-mentioned verses, 1En 23:4 is consistent with

31 Cf. Yadin, Scroll 237. On the concept of the four towers, see Carmignac, Règle 131-137.

32 Although the Aramaic form of the name is not attested in the Qumran fragments of 1 Enoch, there exists a striking parallel with the person Raguel (mentioned frequently in Tobit 6-10) whose original Aramaic name רָגָעֵל is confirmed by 4Q197 Fr. 4; cf. Charles, Version 53; Milik, Books 219; Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 311.

33 Cf. Black, Book 162; Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 311.

34 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 310-311.

35 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 311.

the characterization of Raguel given in 20:4 (“who takes vengeance on the world of the luminaries”).

Whether the author assumed that, in fact, all luminaries had sinned and therefore deserved punishment, or whether he only meant to refer to all *transgressing* luminaries, remains an open question. Yet, it seems quite safe to conclude that originally it was Raguel’s task to take vengeance on the luminaries, and that only later 1En 23:4 achieved its present form which now describes the stream of fire as *pursuing* (ἐκδιώκω) the stars. This modification has not necessarily been caused by a scribal error, but may as well be the result of an intentional change by the hand of a redactor, who may have found the reference to the punishment of all luminaries problematic and therefore changed the passage to a description of an astronomical phenomenon. In any case, there is no clear connection between the name of Raguel, the “friend/shepherd of God”, and his role as avenger (or pursuer) of the luminaries.³⁶

Michael, the fourth of the seven archangels mentioned in 1En 20, has become known as the patron of Israel. A similar role is already attributed to him in 1En 20:5 saying that he has been “put in charge of the good ones of the people (i.e. of Israel).” Although the readings of the Greek and Ethiopic manuscripts differ considerably, this translation most likely reflects the original reading, insofar as 1En 25:4-5 also associates Michael with the righteous ones (cf. 10:16-18).³⁷ In the Book of Daniel, Michael is not only responsible for the elect: as “the great prince, the guardian of [Daniel’s] people” (12:1), he is fighting the angelic princes of Persia and Greece (Dan 10:13, 21), and he will arise at the time of the greatest distress, prior to the delivery of those “whose name is written in the Book” (12:1).³⁸

Aspects from both 1En and the Book of Daniel return in the War Scroll where Michael opposes the “Prince of Iniquity” (i.e. Belial) and stands up for Israel (1QM XVII 5-8). As the “Prince of Light” (רְשָׁ

36 Milik, Books 219-220, suggests that the Greek verb ἐκδιώκω in 1En 23:4 is the translation of the Aramaic נָגַר which he takes to mean “to follow the flock,” and he herein finds a link to the shepherd-function of Raguel. Still, this suggestion is hardly convincing as it is based on connotations of the verb נָגַר that are only known from Sabaitic; cf. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 311. A different interpretation is offered by Charles, Version 61, who understands ἐκδιώκω as the rendering of the Aramaic עֲמַר, which might be the corrupt reading of an original עֲמַר (“feeds” / “nourishes”). This explanation is also highly speculative and can not prove a connection with the name רְעוֹאֵל.

37 Cf. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 294-295; see, however, Black, Book 163, according to whom Michael is set “over the benefits” of Israel.

38 Cf. also 1En 90:14 where the angelic scribe that supports Judas Maccabaeus and his fraction is most likely Michael (see above, n. 21).

המְאֹר(³⁹) he is set over “all sons of righteousness and spirits of truth” (1QM XIII 10), thus being especially connected with the fraction of the righteous, which consists of both humans and heavenly beings. One may, in fact, assume that the War Scroll already uses the term ‘Israel’ as a designation of the righteous, which no longer includes the rest of the people. The front line rather runs between the sons of light and the sons of darkness, the former belonging to the lot of God (and his archangel Michael),⁴⁰ while the latter are part of the lot of Belial and include not only the nations, but also those that break the covenant (1QM I 1-7). Consequently, the name of Michael, written on the shields of one of the four towers, provides the assistance of this angel in the final battle (1QM IX 15-16). It must, however, not be overlooked that in this passage Michael is but one of the four archangels and is not explicitly connected with a specific rank or function.⁴¹

Together with the same three archangels (Raphael, Sariel and Gabriel), Michael beseeches God to take action with regard to the defilement caused by the fallen watchers (1En 9).⁴² He then takes part in their punishment by imprisoning Shemihazah and his associates as well as destroying their breed (1En 10:11-15), and finally renovates the earth (10:16-11:2). While in these passages Michael simply acts as “one of the chief princes” אֶחָד הַשָּׂרִים הַרְאָשָׁנִים, as Dan 10:13 calls him, 1En 24:6 explicitly designates him as the leader of the archangels.⁴³ This idea of Michael’s supremacy, which becomes dominant in later literature,⁴⁴

39 That the “Prince of Light” is indeed Michael and not Uriel becomes clear against the background of his close connection with Israel and the parallel in 1QM XVII 6 which speaks of “the reign of Michael in the eternal light”. On this identification, see also Yadin, Scroll 235-236; Carmignac, Règle 136; Davidson, Angels 147-149.

40 Cf. Davidson, Angels 219,224-226.

41 A combination of the motifs known from 1QM returns in Rev 12:7 where Michael and his angels fight the dragon and the heavenly beings following him. The idea that Michael opposes Satan can also be expressed with regard to certain episodes of the biblical history (cf. Jude 9; L.A.E. 13-14).

42 Related to this motif is the idea that Michael acts as a mediator who intercedes for Israel. Cf. 1En 89-90 where the angelic scribe, most likely Michael, repeatedly informs God of the wicked deeds that the shepherd angels have committed against Israel; see also Test Levi 5:6-7; Test Dan 6:1-5.

43 It should, however, be noted that the early lists of four archangels always mention Michael first (1En 9:1; 40:9-10; 54:6; 71:8-9, 13; 1QM IX 15), hereby possibly reflecting the idea of his supremacy over the other archangels. See also the list of the seven archangels (1En 20) where Michael is not mentioned first but fourth, thus marking the centre.

44 Cf. T Isa 1:6; Mart Isa 3:15-16; 3 En 17:3; Hebr. T. Naph. 8-9. The combination of the idea of Michael’s supremacy with his military functions has led to his designation as ἀρχιστρατηγός (2 En 22:6; 33:10; 72:5; Gk Apoc Ezra 4:24; cf. already Dan 8:11 LXX

has been construed in a remarkable way in 1QM XVII 7-8. According to this passage, Michael will be exalted above the heavenly beings (אֲלֵיָם) in correspondence to the growing of Israel's hegemony over the nations.⁴⁵ Thus, the War Scroll connects the motif of a special relationship between Michael and Israel to the idea that the angelic and the human world are closely linked with one another.⁴⁶

As the supreme heavenly being, Michael can even be described in terms that were once exclusively reserved for God himself. The terminology used to express the idea of Michael's dominion over all other heavenly beings (1QM XVII 7: *לְהָרִים בְּאֲלֵיָם מִשְׁרַת מִיכָּאֵל*) is reminiscent of the Psalms where it is YHWH who is raised above the assembly of the divine.⁴⁷ The same phenomenon occurs in 11Q13 II 10 where Ps 82:1 is explicitly interpreted as a reference to Melchizedek⁴⁸ who here functions as the main protagonist in a struggle similar to that envisaged in 1QM. Therefore, it has been suggested that both, Michael and Melchizedek, are but different names for one and the same supreme angel.⁴⁹ Traces of the deification of Michael are also found in 1En 40:9. Introduced as "the merciful and long-suffering," Michael is again connected with attributes that were originally characteristic of God alone.⁵⁰ Thus, in its later development, the figure of Michael claims such a high status that one is almost tempted to answer the question implied by the name *מִיכָּאֵל* („who is like God?“)⁵¹ by pointing to this very archangel.

The fifth archangel mentioned in 1En 20 is Sariel. Due to textual problems, the task ascribed to him in 20:6 is not entirely clear. However, with regard to 1En 27:2 where Sariel appears again,⁵² it seems

where the same term occurs, although it is not clear, whether it is applied to Michael). Note, however, that Gk Apoc Ezra 1:4 calls Raphael ἀρχιστρατηγός.

45 Cf. Davidson, Angels 202-203.

46 On this belief in the connection between both spheres, which was crucial to the Qumran community, see e.g. Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien* 209-255.

47 Cf. e.g. Ps 29:1; 82:1; 89:7.

48 Cf. Berner, *Jahre* 435; VanderKam, *Chronologies* 174.

49 Cf. e.g. van der Woude, Melchizedek 369-372. See, however, Davidson, Angels 263, who correctly points out that, at the respective time, there were apparently "various beliefs about the name of the leading angel".

50 Cf. e.g. Ps 103:8; 111:4; 145:8.

51 It has been suggested that the figure of Michael is in fact no other than the depotinalized Canaanite deity Mikal which was transformed into a supreme angel to comply with the hegemony of YHWH; cf. e.g. Hengel, *Judentum* 344-345. This hypothesis is not impossible, but can hardly be proved, the more so, as Michael is already attested as a personal name in the OT (cf. e.g. Num 13:13).

52 Although the Greek text of 1En 27:2 mentions Uriel, it is likely to assume that this name – as in chs. 9-10 – has replaced the original reading Sariel. Otherwise, Uriel would have appeared twice during Enoch's heavenly journey (in chs. 21 and 27),

most likely that the angel was introduced as the one “who is in charge of the spirits who sin against the spirit.”⁵³ Sariel would thus be the archangel responsible for the spirits of those who have spoken blasphemy and are, as a result, gathered in the cursed valley (27:2). That “the name Sariel, ‘God is my prince,’ *may* imply an acclamation of God in answer to such blasphemy,”⁵⁴ is an interesting observation, which nevertheless does not explain satisfactorily why this particular angel was entrusted with supervising the punishing place of the blasphemers.

Little more can be learned about the functions of Sariel, although he must have once played no marginal role, being counted among the four archangels of 1En 9-10 and only later replaced by Uriel. According to 1En 10:1-3, Sariel reveals to Noah the coming of the Flood and instructs him on the measures that are to be taken in order to survive imminent destruction. The scene finds a clear parallel in the Animal Apocalypse, and it is therefore likely to assume that the anonymous archangel who teaches Noah a secret (1En 89:1) is to be identified with Sariel.⁵⁵ In the Qumranic writings Sariel appears only once, as one of the four archangels whose names are to be written on the shields attached to the four towers in order to provide angelic support in the final battle (1QM IX 15-16).

The sixth archangel mentioned in 1En 20 is Gabriel “who is in charge of paradise and the serpents and the cherubim” (20:7). This characterization finds its closest parallel in 1En 32:6 where Enoch beholds the tree of wisdom and is informed about its part in Adam’s and Eve’s expulsion from Paradise. Although the extant versions of the text name Raphael as Enoch’s companion, the background of 20:7 suggests that ‘Gabriel’ was the original reading.⁵⁶ The idea that Gabriel’s responsibility includes the serpents and the cherubim implies that the archangel is also in charge of the guardians that are posted at the entrance of Para-

while Sariel, although included in the introductory list of ch. 20, would have played no part at all; cf. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 319.

53 Cf. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 294-296. A different reconstruction of 1En 20:6 is offered by Black, Book 163, who assumes that Sariel is in charge of the spirits that cause apostasy. It does, however, not accord with 1En 27:2.

54 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 319.

55 Cf. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 375; Tiller, Commentary 258-259.

56 This also becomes clear when one recalls the structure of 1En 20: while Raphael, who is mentioned second, already accompanies Enoch to the Mountain of the Dead (ch. 22), Gabriel would have his likely place after Sariel (cf. 20:6-7), that is after ch. 27; cf. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 321.

dise (Gen 3:24).⁵⁷ A different aspect of Gabriel is stressed in 1En 40:9 where he is envisaged as the archangel who is “set over all the powers” (δυνάμεις), that is, over the “astral and angelic [...] ‘potentates’”⁵⁸ (cf. Test Levi 3:3).

Still another picture of Gabriel is drawn in the Book of Daniel. Gabriel here appears as the *angelus interpres* who explains to Daniel the meaning of his vision of the ram and he-goat (8:16-17) and reveals to him the true significance of Jeremiah’s prophecy on the seventy years of exile (9:21).⁵⁹ Although the *angelus interpres* of Daniel’s final vision (chs. 10-12) is not identified by name, it is most likely Gabriel again, whose appearance is here described in terms of Ezekiel’s vision of the heavenly beings that escort the chariot (Dan 10:5-6; cf. Ezek 1).⁶⁰ Moreover, we learn that, together with Michael, the respective angel is engaged in wrestling with the patron angels of Persia and Greece (10:13, 20-21). It is this military function that allows the easiest connection with the name גֶּבֶר־אֵל (“God is my hero/warrior”).⁶¹

A related aspect occurs in 1QM IX 15-16 where Gabriel is included among the four archangels who support the sons of light in their strife against the sons of darkness (see above). As a member of the same angelic group, Gabriel already puts an end to the defilement and wickedness caused by the fallen watchers (1En 9-10). Here, it is his special task to destroy the giants that were born by the mortal women who had forbidden intercourse with the watchers (10:9-10). It is, however, noteworthy that this passage is a doublet to 10:15 where similar measures are taken by Michael. One may, therefore, assume that Gabriel’s mission against the breed of the watchers is possibly a later addition which served the purpose of “fill[ing] out the number of the archangels to a traditional four.”⁶²

57 The serpents (δράκοντες) are most likely to be interpreted as the seraphim, “identified with the fiery sword of Gen 3:24” (Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 296; cf. Black, Book 163; Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien* 264).

58 Black, Book 200.

59 As a revelatory angel, Gabriel also appears in Luke 1:19, 26 where he foretells the births of John the Baptist and Jesus.

60 Cf. Collins, Daniel 373-374. See, however, Charles, Commentary 258, who argues that the angel must be of higher rank than Gabriel, because he has a more powerful effect on Daniel. This argument is far from convincing, because it ignores the fact that Dan 8-12 were written by more than one author. Different descriptions of one and the same angelic being may therefore easily exist side by side.

61 On this rendering of the name Gabriel, see e.g. Fitzmyer, Gospel 328; Collins, Daniel 336. Alternatively, one could interpret it as “man of God” or “God has shown himself strong.” On the latter option, see Noth, *Personennamen* 190.

62 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 223.

The last among the seven archangels mentioned in 1En 20 is Remiel “whom God has put in charge of them that rise” (20:8). As has already been noted, the respective verse is not only textually dubious, but also provides the only evidence for an angel of that name in 1 Enoch.⁶³ Yet, maybe the anonymous angel presenting the heavenly tablets in 81:1 is to be identified with Remiel. His description in 20:8 suggests that Remiel was connected with the resurrection of the dead, a connection that may involve a play on the root *רָם* Hifil (“to lift up”), which is part of his name.⁶⁴ The particular function of Remiel might have been to lead the resurrected from the nether world “to the judgement seat of God.”⁶⁵ The picture of Remiel that is drawn by 1En 20:8 is reminiscent of the angel Jeremiel in 4 Ezra 4:36 who tells the souls of the righteous about the preconditions of their resurrection. Possibly Remiel and Jeremiel are but different names for the same angelic figure.⁶⁶

4. Conclusions

From the fourth century BCE onward there is a number of Jewish sources that deal either with groups of archangels or with some of their individual representatives. The respective texts already reflect a diversity of traditions that do not fit in one big picture, but rather exist side by side. Neither the overall number of archangels nor the names of those who were to be counted among this number was a settled issue, let alone the specific tasks attributed to each of them. Depending on the different literary contexts, these parameters may vary considerably, and it is evident that different angelic protagonists could be entrusted with almost identical tasks in order to reach a significant overall number of archangels.⁶⁷

As it is virtually impossible to disentangle the different threads that constitute the multifaceted picture of the archangels in early Jewish writings, the historical development of the respective part of angelology cannot be reconstructed with certainty. Yet, it is clear that the archangels must at least have been of importance for the theology of certain Jewish circles from early Second Temple times onward. From what we

63 See, however, 1En 6:7 where a certain Ramael (4QEn^a Fr. 1 III 7: ל[ענמ]א) is mentioned as one of the chieftains of the rebel watcher Shemihazah.

64 Cf. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 296.

65 Black, Book 163.

66 Cf. Bousset / Greßmann, Religion 325; Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1 296. See, however, Stone, Fourth Ezra 97, who denies the identity of Remiel and Jeremiel.

67 See above with regard to the commissioning of Gabriel in 1En 10:9-10.

learn in 1En and the Book of Daniel, the archangels feature primarily as God's supreme agents in fighting the wicked throughout history and in revealing the mysteries of the world and the hidden course of history to the chosen ones. This is, however, only the perspective we gain from some select writings which reflect the sophisticated positions of theologians. Still a different matter are the beliefs and practices of the common people on which the literary sources discussed in this article remain silent.⁶⁸

Abstract

The Book of Watchers (1En 6-36) contains two lists of archangels which only agree in counting Michael, Gabriel and Raphael among the supreme heavenly beings. The major difference between both lists lies in the overall number of archangels. While 1En 9-10 count four angelic princes (the three aforementioned angels and Sariel) who oppose the fallen watchers, 1En 20 gives the names of seven archangels (adding Uriel, Raguel, Sariel and Remiel to the group of the three) who accompany Enoch on his heavenly journey (1En 21-36). Both traditions have had a great impact upon reception history, which is already shown by their attestation in other Jewish sources of Second Temple times. The individual profile of a specific archangel is not always clear-cut and may become almost unrecognizable when the respective angel is acting as part of a group. However, there are certain characteristics (e.g. Michael's patronage over Israel and Raphael's healing powers) that are already dominant in the early Jewish sources and have remained so until today.

68 Only beneath the surface of the texts one gets a glimpse of popular beliefs connected with some of the archangels. The most obvious example is Raphael, whose healing powers are hardly a mere theoretical concept, but most likely reflect the practice of appealing to this very angel in order to achieve healing (cf. also the scene in John 5:4). Still one step further is the (cultic) worship of certain angels, which is reflected by polemic statements (cf. e.g. Rev 19:10; Col 2:18); on this issue see Mach, Entwicklungsstadien, 291-300.

Bibliography

Berner, C., *Jahre, Jahrwochen und Jubiläen. Heptadische Geschichtskonzeptionen im Antiken Judentum* (BZAW 363), Berlin / New York 2006.

Black, M., *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece* (PVTG 3), Leiden 1970.

Black, M., *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch* (SVTP 7), Leiden 1985.

Bousset, W. / Gressmann, H., *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (HNT 21), Tübingen 1926.

Boyce, M., *Aməša Spənta*: EIr I (1985) 933-936.

Carmignac, J., *La Règle de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres*, Paris 1958.

Charles, R.H., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, Oxford 1929.

Charles, R.H., *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*, Oxford 1906.

Collins, J.J., *Daniel* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis 1993.

Davidson, M.J., *Angels at Qumran* (JSPE.S 11), Sheffield 1992.

Dochhorn, J., *Die Apokalypse des Mose* (TSAJ 106), Tübingen 2005.

Ebeling, E., *Dämonen*, in: RLA II 1938, 106-113.

Fitzmyer, J.A., *The Gospel According to Luke* (AncB 28), Garden City, New York 1981.

Geffcken, J., *Die Oracula Sibyllina* (GCS 8), Leipzig 1902.

Ginzberg, L., *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte*, Hildesheim 1972.

Gunkel, H., *Der Schreiberengel Nabû im A. T. und im Judentum*: ARW 1 (1898) 294-300.

Hengel, M., *Judentum und Hellenismus. Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jhs v. Chr.* (WUNT 10), Tübingen 1988.

Kohut, A., *Ueber die jüdische Angelologie und Daemonologie in ihrer Abhängigkeit vom Parsismus* (AKM 4), Leipzig 1866.

Mach, M., *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit* (TSAJ 34), Tübingen 1992.

Milik, J.T., *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*, Oxford 1976.

Nickelsburg, G.W.E., *1 Enoch 1* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis 2001.

Noth, M., *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (BWANT 3.10), Stuttgart 1928.

Stone, M.E., *Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis 1990.

Tiller, P.A., *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch* (SBL Early Judaism and its Literature 4), Atlanta 1993.

Uehlinger, Chr. / Müller Trufaut, S., *Ezekiel 1, Babylonian Cosmological Scholarship and Iconography. Attempts at Further Refinement*: ThZ 57 (2001) 140-171.

van der Woude, A.S., *Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI*: OTS 14 (1965) 354-373.

VanderKam, J.C., *Sabbatical Chronologies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature*, in: Lim, T.H. (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*, Edinburgh 2000, 159-178.

VanderKam, J.C., *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQ.MS 16), Washington 1984.

Wernberg-Møller, P., *The Manual of Discipline* (StTDJ 1), Leiden 1957.

Yadin, Y., *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, Oxford 1962.

